

APR 25 2003

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: COHEN & STEINBRECHER, a/k/a
Bob M. Cohen & Associates,
Law Corporation,

Debtor,

COHEN & STEINBRECHER, a/k/a Bob M.
Cohen & Associates Law Corporation,

Appellant,

v.

STEINBRECHER & ASSOCIATES,

Appellee.

No. 02-15018

BAP No. NC-01-01355-PKMa

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the Ninth Circuit
Bankruptcy Appellate Panel
Perris, Klein and Marlar, Bankruptcy Judges, Presiding

Submitted March 11, 2003**
San Francisco, California

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Before: RYMER, KLEINFELD, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Bob M. Cohen & Associates Law Corporation (“Cohen”) appeals from the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel’s (BAP) decision affirming the bankruptcy court’s denial of Cohen’s “Motion . . . For Further Enforcement of Settlement Agreement and Related Court Orders” and affirming the bankruptcy court’s imposition of sanctions. Cohen does not challenge the factual findings made by the bankruptcy court.

We affirm the bankruptcy court’s denial of Cohen’s motion for the reasons stated by the BAP. We further hold that the bankruptcy court did not abuse its discretion by sanctioning Cohen pursuant to its inherent authority. We decline to consider Cohen’s other arguments relating to sanctions that are raised for the first time on appeal. *See In re Cybernetic Servs., Inc.*, 252 F.3d 1039, 1045 n.3 (9th Cir. 2001) (declining, in an appeal from a BAP decision, to address arguments not raised below as waived).

AFFIRMED.